



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Introduction

Citation for published version:

Smith, ADM, Trousdale, G & Waltereit, R 2015, Introduction. in ADM Smith, G Trousdale & R Waltereit (eds), *New Directions in Grammaticalisation Research*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

New Directions in Grammaticalisation Research

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Introduction

Andrew Smith, Graeme Trousdale and Richard Wälchli

In 2012, the University of Edinburgh hosted the *New Reflections on Grammaticalization 5* conference; the contributions to the present volume are based at least in part on presentations given at that conference. The conference was in part a celebration of grammaticalization, taking place as it did 100 years after Antoine Meillet (1912) first introduced the term; in the first contribution to the volume ('Meillet and grammaticalization'), **John Joseph** provides an account of Meillet's own understanding of the nature of grammaticalization developed over time. It is interesting to observe how some of the issues that Meillet raises in his early twentieth century papers still provoke debate today. For example, the relationship between analogy and grammaticalization is a central issue for Kiparsky (2012), while the on-going battle between formal and functional linguists regarding abrupt vs. gradual change is critically appraised by Newmeyer (2014). Joseph's chapter also outlines the influence of Saussure on Meillet, and suggests some of the ways in which Saussure's thinking may be aligned with Meillet's on the nature of linguistic change.

Since Meillet's landmark paper, grammaticalization studies have formed a central part of research in language change, perhaps most especially in the last thirty years. One key recent development that emerged at the conference, and is reflected in this volume, is that grammaticalization is increasingly understood to cover a much broader range of phenomena than the diachronic move from "lexicon" to "grammar" as originally understood by Meillet. In particular, grammaticalization now encompasses also gestures and prosody. Thus, from a narrow descriptive tool grammaticalization has broadened into a concept that helps researchers to understand a wide range of form-function pairings and their relationship in language, a move that was arguably enabled by the reinterpretation of grammaticalization in terms of constructions (see e.g. Gisborne and Patten 2011). In this volume, we present some of the latest thinking on grammaticalization, showcasing research which draws on a wide variety of languages and which seeks to refine our understanding of the concept of grammaticalization and related aspects of language change. In this

introduction, we provide a brief summary of key issues raised in each contribution, while at the same time reflecting on some of the current issues in grammaticalization research in order to provide a context for the research presented in this book.

Roland Pfau's chapter ('The grammaticalization of headshakes: From head movement to negative head') explores grammaticalization within the domain of sign languages, which, as Pfau & Steinbach (2011) observe, is a relatively new direction for research in grammaticalization studies. In particular, Pfau's contribution explores the relationship between non-manual gesture and the structural properties of sign languages. This is achieved through a comparison of the use of headshakes in both signed and spoken linguistic systems. Pfau suggests that the headshake gesture has grammaticalized into a negation marker in a number of sign languages in the world. Since gestures may have a phonological, morphological or syntactic role, a comparison of particular gestures across different signed languages may provide an insight into how more grammatical functions of such gestures develop. While in spoken languages headshakes have a number of co-speech functions (including as epistemic hedges, and as intensifiers), their function in signed languages is more clearly grammaticalized as a negator (though there may also be headshakes which appear to function as hedges, just as in spoken languages). In some signed languages (such as Italian Sign Language and Turkish Sign Language) the headshake is used alongside a manual negator; in others (such as Flemish Sign Language and Indopakistani Sign Language), the headshake alone may function as the sole negator in the clause. In this latter type, the use of the headshake as negator has significant language-particular constraints relating to its scope properties. Pfau concludes with a comparison of signed and spoken languages with regard to negation patterns, and some comments on possible diachronic trajectories in connection with formal accounts of negation marking in the history of spoken languages (e.g. Pollock 1989, van Gelderen 2008), particular from a more formal account of the architecture of language.

Fischer (2007) presents an account of morphosyntactic change which compares and contrasts formal generativist approaches with functional grammaticalization ones. Such approaches are not necessarily mutually

exclusive (the concept of grammaticalization is invoked, for instance, in the work of Roberts & Roussou 2003 and van Gelderen), but Fischer's distinction neatly captures a prevailing view of grammaticalization research, namely that it is largely 'functional' in orientation. This has sometimes led to the unfortunate conclusion that grammaticalization is concerned only with meaning change, but it is in fact, as McMahon (1994: 161) notes, the "cross-componential change *par excellence*". This issue of meaning change and its relation to change in the grammar is of particular concern in the development of discourse markers of various kinds. The development of discourse markers has been said to constitute a different but related change, namely pragmaticalization (see e.g. Diewald 2011). Pragmaticalization shares with grammaticalization the development of a new procedural construction, but issues regarding obligatorification, and fixing in a particular position in (or outwith) the clause, lend discourse markers a particular set of properties rather different to (for example), tense and aspect markers. As Diewald (2011) observes, many of the distinctions relate to how the analyst conceptualizes 'grammar'. Noting the inherently indexical nature of grammatical elements, Diewald (2011: 461) suggests "[t]his indexical relation, no matter in which modified and abstracted version it may appear, is finally based on a deictic relation and is thus deeply entrenched into pragmatics". Given the recent debates on grammaticalization as expansion and as reduction (see for instance Himmelmann 2004, Fischer 2007 and Traugott 2010a), and the relationship between pragmatic enrichment and semantic bleaching in grammaticalization, we have included a number of contributions whose aims include a further investigation of the relationship between pragmatic change and grammaticalization.

An example of such a contribution is that of **Gudrun Rawoens** ('The Swedish connective *så att* 'so that': From subordinator to discourse marker'). In her study, Rawoens explores data from traditional print media and from online blogs to consider whether the development of *så att* in Swedish constitutes a case of pragmaticalization in the sense of Diewald (2011). The focus of the study is primarily on synchronic variation and the evidence that provides for on-going language change. Rawoens considers both syntactic changes (e.g. a shift from hypotactic to paratactic linking element) and semantic-pragmatic changes (e.g. a

shift from a syntactic linking element to a discourse marker), and suggests that some of the patterns observable in the synchronic corpus suggest uses of *så att* that are at variance with traditional grammatical descriptions of the form. These patterns include not only use of *så att* as a co-ordinator, but also the appearance of *så att* in sentence final position, which suggests increased use as a discourse marker.

Karin Beijering's contribution ('The lexicalization-grammaticalization-pragmaticalization interface: The case of Mainland Scandinavian *I think*') discusses the development of constructions meaning 'I think' in Mainland Scandinavian languages (e.g. Swedish *jag tror*). Beijering's account focuses on tracking a number of composite changes in the Swedish, Danish and Norwegian data, i.e. micro-changes at various linguistic levels, such as phonetic reduction and morphological fusion, then considering how such micro-changes collectively serve to constitute pragmaticalization (or grammaticalization, or lexicalization, depending on the micro-changes involved). Using data from various written corpora, Beijering considers how some particular variability in the use of 'I think'-type constructions in the Scandinavian languages – particularly with regard to the extra-propositional status of these constructions, and their communicative function – suggests that the changes involved warrant characterization as pragmaticalization. These data and the analysis that Beijering provides address the important issues of scope expansion in grammaticalization and the obligatory status of grammaticalized forms. The first of these is typically associated with an 'expansion' model of grammaticalization, the latter a 'reduction' model (on which see further Traugott 2010a).

Related to this is the development of epistemic and evidential marking. The contribution by **María José López-Couso & Belén Méndez-Naya** ('Evidential/epistemic markers of the type verb + complementizer: Some parallels from English and Romance') discusses how speakers of languages which lack a grammatical category of evidentiality may nevertheless use particular expressions that have an evidential or epistemic function. The evolution of such evidential expressions shows strong parallels with grammaticalization. López-Couso & Méndez-Naya's research on both English and Romance languages considers the developments of sequences of verb and

complementizer (e.g. Galician *disque* or *seica*, English *looks like*). Such patterns are shown to have undergone formal decategorialization, layering and fixation, among other things, while also developing either subjective or intersubjective functions. The development of such forms in these languages is contrasted with the more clearly grammaticalized evidential marking in languages whose speakers obligatorily distinguish first-hand from reported evidence (e.g. South American languages like Quechua and North American languages like Iroquoian), and the findings raise interesting questions concerning the status of grammaticalization as a theory of language change (i.e. its predictive power), and the 'matrix clause' hypothesis for the development of parentheticals (Thompson & Mulac 1991).

Parentheticals also feature heavily in **Tetsuharu Moriya & Kaoru Horie**'s chapter entitled 'The Neg-Raising phenomenon as a product of grammaticalization'. They suggest that in expressions of the kind *I don't think John will come* 'I think John will not come' there is a shift, as a consequence of a grammaticalization process, whereby the historically 'main' clause is reanalyzed as a parenthetical. This new parenthetical can be used by the speaker or writer to express his or her attitude towards what is proposed in the historically 'subordinate' clause. The authors review functional and pragmatic accounts of these and related expressions in both English and Japanese, contrasting them with transformational and other formal approaches. The authors link the development of negative parentheticals to their positive counterparts, showing how certain features of grammaticalization (such as decategorialization, semantic bleaching and pragmatic enrichment) are shared across both the negative and positive constructions; they also point out certain formal properties that link the two sets (such as preference for present tense forms of the verb and first person singular subjects).

(Inter)subjectification has been an important topic in diachronic semantics and pragmatics (see Traugott 2010b for an overview). Work on subjectivity and subjectification has often been especially concerned with the different properties of sequences in the left versus the right periphery of the clause (LP and RP). These issues are addressed by **Yuko Higashiizumi** in her chapter, entitled 'Periphery of utterances and (inter)subjectification in Modern

Japanese: A case study of competing causal conjunctions and connective particles'. Her focus concerns the relationship between LP and RP elements in the history of Japanese. This is exemplified by an analysis of recent diachronic variation in the use of causal *kara*- and *node*-clauses (typically RP elements in contemporary Japanese) and *dakara* and *nanode* (typically LP elements meaning 'therefore' or 'so' in contemporary Japanese). Higashiizumi suggests that the various forms each have their own history, but there appear to be some overlaps in terms of the general development of the forms. Both *kara*- and *node*-clauses are found in the RP in contemporary Japanese corpus that Higashiizumi makes use of, but only *dakara* appears in the LP: no instances of *nanode* in the LP are found in this corpus, though there are reports of its use in the LP in other studies. The function of these peripheral elements appears to be to convey aspects of the speaker's (inter)subjective perspective on the discourse.

Alexander Haselow's contribution ('Left vs. right periphery in grammaticalization: The case of *anyway*') explores related issues regarding LP and RP phenomena. Taking a discourse-analytic position on the historical development of *anyway* in the history of English, Haselow considers LP elements to be concerned primarily with discourse coherence and the structural organization of the text, with RP elements more concerned with the expression of subjective meanings, as well as functioning to link adjacent utterances. In terms of new directions in grammaticalization research, Haselow's contribution sheds new light on the functional differences between LP and RP elements, demonstrating how speakers may come to use a grammaticalized form for different purposes, depending on its structural position relative to other elements in the discourse unit. Haselow's research also links the development of *anyway* at both the LP and RP in English to similar developments in other languages (e.g. the use of *alors* and of disjoint pronouns in French, on which see Degand and Fagard (2011) and Detges and Waltereit (2014) respectively).

The relationship between grammaticalization and the development of subjective meanings is also central to the contribution by **Bert Cornillie & Álvaro S. Octavio de Toleda y Huerta** ('The diachrony of subjective *amenazar* "threaten": On Latin-induced grammaticalization in Spanish'). The authors suggest that the development of *amenazar* and other related verbs of

threatening in Spanish is not as is presented in traditional accounts of verbs of threatening cross-linguistically. Instead, they suggest that the syntactic history of the relevant constructions should be considered in the context of particular discourse traditions (reflected in part in current stylistic properties associated with the forms), and in the context of language contact. They present corpus evidence that suggests that the newer subjective reading of *amenazar* followed by an infinitive has its origins in a syntactically rather different construction (where the complement is a noun, rather than an infinitive), which is modeled on sequences in Latin. In that language, the deponent verb *minari* ‘threaten’ may co-occur with nouns with similarly negative semantics. The authors suggest that subjective uses of this construction may be found in later Latin texts in the humanist tradition. They also track some relevant constructional variants (e.g. with and without a preposition between the finite verb and the infinitive), as well as the relationship between the constructions where the complement is a noun and those where the complement is an infinitive.

The role of language contact in grammaticalization is a central theme in the contribution by **Theodore Markopoulos** (‘Contact-induced grammaticalization in older texts: the Medieval Greek analytic comparatives’). Markopoulos considers the importance of understanding (as far as is possible) the social context in which speakers of earlier varieties of languages operated, especially in cases where speakers of historically related languages are in close contact with one another. The chapter addresses the important question of how (indeed, whether) it is possible to identify a change as a product of contact or of ‘internal’ grammaticalization in cases where the input varieties are typologically very similar and the historical record suggests speakers of the input varieties were in regular contact. Markopoulos argues that the development of analytic comparative grades of adjectives in Greek provides a useful test case. The Medieval Greek form appears not to be a continuation from a related form in the Hellenistic-Roman period, but instead a later innovation, which Markopoulos suggests is connected to similar developments in Romance languages, and which appeared in Medieval Greek as a result of extensive contact between Greek-Romance bilinguals. Markopoulos draws on the textual history of particular works in order to support the claims for a contact-based origin of the innovation.

The subject of synchronic gradience and its relationship both to gradual change generally and grammaticalization in particular has been a topic of recent interest in the field (see for example the contributions in Traugott and Trousdale 2010). In her discussion of the development of *take* as a serial verb in western urban varieties of Nigerian Pidgin, **Maria Mazzoli** considers the various small steps involved in the transition from main verb to serial verb (and increasingly to modal verb) in this language. Mazzoli suggests that the structural framework for serial verbs in Nigerian Pidgin may be a consequence of loan translations from the Kwa/Benue-Congo substrates, while suggesting that the transition of *take* from a serial verb to a modal verb is a grammaticalization phenomenon which occurs as a result of a sequence of reanalyses of the collocation of *take* with a second verb.

The issue of gradualness also surfaces in **Jens Nørgård-Sørensen & Lars Heltoft**'s contribution ('Grammaticalization as paradigmatisation'). Developing a thesis expounded in other publications (e.g. Nørgård-Sørensen, Heltoft & Schøsler 2011), the authors question the claim that the notion of the cline is the most appropriate metaphor for the development of grammatical forms from lexical items. Instead, they suggest that the evolution of both morphological items and syntactic structures (including word orders) should be considered as a case of paradigmatisation. These issues are explored with reference to a range of different languages, including Danish, Polish and Russian. In their discussion of gradualness associated both with the traditional cline and with their notion of paradigmaticization, the authors consider differences between change in the idiolect of the speaker, and change in the language of a population of speakers. The development of a paradigm is the result of a set of micro-reanalyses, implemented at the idiolectal level by individual speakers at different times, giving rise to a gradual change across a speech community.

In conclusion, we have found that the contributions in the book address a number of related topics, all of which are promising new directions in grammaticalization research. The chapters which follow deal with a range of languages and consider diverse topics, from pragmaticalization to language contact, and from the grammaticalization of gesture to the abrupt vs. gradual nature of grammatical change. We believe these contributions further our

understanding of key issues in language change, and hope that they encourage further research to provide answers to the many challenges that remain.

References

- Degand, Liesbeth & Benjamin Fagard. 2011. 'Alors' between discourse and grammar: the role of syntactic position. *Functions of Language* 18(1): 29-56.
- Detges, Ulrich & Richard Waltereit. 2014. 'Moi je ne sais pas' vs. 'Je ne sais pas moi': French disjoint pronouns in the left vs. right periphery. In *Discourse functions at the left and the right periphery. Crosslinguistic investigations of language use and language change* [Studies in Pragmatics 12], Kate Beeching & Ulrich Detges, eds., 24-46. Leiden: Brill.
- Diewald, Gabrielle. 2011. Grammaticalization and pragmaticalization. In Narrog & Heine eds., 450-461.
- Fischer, Olga. 2007. *Morphosyntactic Change: Functional and Formal Perspectives* [Oxford Surveys in Syntax and Morphology 2]. Oxford: OUP.
- Gelderen, Elly van. 2008. Negative cycles. *Linguistic Typology* 12: 195-243.
- Gelderen, Elly van. 2010. Features in reanalysis and grammaticalization. In Traugott & Trousdale eds., 129-147.
- Gisborne, Nikolas & Amanda Patten. 2011. Grammaticalization and construction grammar. In Narrog & Heine eds., 92-104.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus. 2004. Lexicalization and grammaticalization: Opposite or orthogonal? In *What Makes Grammaticalization? A Look from its Fringes and its Components* [Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs 158], Walter Bisang, Nikolaus Himmelmann & Björn Wiemer, eds., 19-40. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 2012. Grammaticalization as optimization. In *Grammatical Change: Origins, Nature, Outcomes*, Dianne Jonas, John Whitman & Andrew Garrett, eds., 15-51. Oxford: OUP.
- McMahon, April. 1994. *Understanding Language Change*. Cambridge: CUP.

- Meillet, Antoine. 1912. L'évolution des forms grammaticales. *Scientia (Rivista di Scienza)* 12, 384-400.
- Narrog, Heiko & Bernd Heine (eds.) 2011. *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. New York: OUP.
- Newmeyer, Frederick J. 2014. Syntactic change: between parameters and fuzzy grammar. In *The Sociolinguistics of Grammar*, Tor Åfarli & Brit Maehlum, eds., 37-66. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Nørgård-Sørensen, Jens, Lars Heltoft & Lene Schøsler 2011. *Connecting Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Pfau, Roland & Markus Steinbach. 2011. Grammaticalization in sign languages. In Narrog & Heine eds., 683-695.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. Verb movement, universal grammar, and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20(3): 365-424.
- Roberts, Ian & Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic Change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization* [Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 100]. Cambridge: CUP.
- Thompson, Sandra and Anthony Mulac. 1991. A quantitative perspective on the grammaticalization of epistemic parentheticals in English. In *Approaches to Grammaticalization, Volume 2*, Elizabeth Closs Traugott & Bernd Heine, eds., 313-329. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2010a. Grammaticalization. In *The Continuum Companion to Historical Linguistics*, Silvia Luraghi & Vit Bubenik, eds., 269-283. London: Continuum.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2010b. (Inter)subjectivity and (inter)subjectification: a reassessment. In *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization*, Kristin Davidse, Lieven Vandelanotte & Hubert Cuyckens, eds., 29-71. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & Graeme Trousdale (eds.). 2010. *Gradience, Gradualness and Grammaticalization* [Typological Studies in Language 90]. Amsterdam: Benjamins.